THEOLOGY

VOL. XLVI SEPTEMBER, 1943 No. 279

The Picture of Paradise

FROM the Hellenistic age until the eighteenth century most European thinkers, pagan and Christian, believed that man had fallen from a primeval state of innocence, and that most social institutions, such as private property, slavery, the subordination of classes, and coercive government, were consequences of that fall. They were conventional, not natural: if there were no sin, they need not have existed, but since man had sinned they were numbered among the means of grace whereby he must be disciplined and purged (in the Christian view) for his final salvation and restoration to communion with God in the integrity of his risen and redeemed body and soul.

Some modern historians have been puzzled to know precisely what is the practical importance of this belief in the conventional character of social and political institutions. Property, serfdom, and government were conventional but universal. They were of the law of nations, but not of the natural law. Did that make any real difference to the attitude of medieval men towards them? I think the answer is that, such institutions being means of grace and remedies for sin, their operations could not be idealized. In the hands of sinful men they were expected to work imperfectly, and means were provided, in theory at least, to check their abuse. The idea of an absolute ownership of property, or of an absolute monarchy, unfettered by natural, divine and positive law, is unknown to the Middle Ages, where all property is held on conditions of service, and all kings, even the Pope-king, are subject to law and custom, and liable to deposition if they fall into heresy or persistently violate their coronation oath. The absolute state is a product of the Renaissance tendency to obscure the fallen condition of man, and to allow to communities and their chief magistrates a wider licence to make new positive laws without so much regard to the permanent limitations of human life, which in the Middle Ages seemed to confine all human initiative within all too narrow limits.

But it was not until Rousseau that the idea of the state of nature was revolutionized. In his *Contrat Social* natural liberty becomes something which is by no means irretrievably lost. Liberty might be and must be regained if we can only escape from the psychological conditions imposed upon us by hundreds of years of organized religion and government, and make a new start on the basis of a true social contract, rooted in the general will. Ever since Rousseau's time Europe has been haunted by the possibility of a perfectly just society, which might be established if we could only rid ourselves of certain perverse features in the organization of politics and economics. Even those who claim to be conservatives have been political idealists, and have dreamed of restoring justice by eliminating not thousands but hundreds of years

and returning to the "golden Middle Ages." Perfection in some accessible period of the past or of the future has been for many people a familiar idea, but primeval perfection has faded out. Even among the orthodox the story of Eden has no longer any very strong hold on the imagination.

This change cannot simply be the result of the theory of evolution, which in itself offers small hope of moral or cultural progress, and none of rapid biological change. No doubt modern discoveries in ancient history, anthropology, and biology have made it harder for us to imagine the mind and soul of primitive man, and to picture him in that critical time, short or long as it may have been, when he was already much more than an animal, capable of communion with God, and of his own kind of reason and virtue, capable also of conflict and sin and remorse, but not yet a sinner. The crisis has been pushed farther back into human history, but nothing has yet been discovered to prove that there was no crisis, that man could not have been other than he is. Such changes as this do not prevent the creation of new images, and would in due course have produced a quite fresh picture of primitive perfection (just as changes in our idea of harmony might have given us a new image of the heavenly choirs, with more varied instruments than harps), if European man, Catholic and Protestant, devout and secular, had not become so much more interested in the possibilities of progress and perfection here on earth.

The difficulty of making new images of Heaven and of Eden is illustrated and increased by the decay of religious art. When an image is needed to bring the truth home to ourselves, and no accurate knowledge is possible, we have no means of proceeding, being human beings, except by art. But the art of the nineteenth century was almost entirely helpless to restate spiritual truth. Where scenes from contemporary life or historical events were described, realism produced the appearance of a scientific record as nearly as possible. But where the saints or the supernatural enter, they were generally kept at a discreet distance from the real world. Victorian saints and angels know their place. They nearly always wear period costume, and seldom join in common conversation. They exist in stained glass; they are matters of devotion and æstheticism, overbeliefs with little or no relation to the tangible realities of a world of science and machines. And with them were Eden and Heaven, when Eden and Heaven entered the consciousness at all.

Modern art has in part recovered the capacity to represent spiritual truth. Modern church architects are certainly trying, albeit too often very self-consciously, to make modern engineering a medium for the expression of religious aspiration, and the poetry in the Pelican *Anthology of Religious Verse* is certainly not of the stained-glass-window variety. Mr T. S. Eliot in particular has given us new images of heavenly beatitude "at the still point of the turning world"; but the garden of Eden is not exactly in his line. It is hard for any of the older generation to portray the earthly paradise in terms which are not immediately suggestive of utopia.

But a generation is growing up to-day who have never expected

perpetual peace or hoped for a perfect society. If in 1919 the elder statesmen of the Allies had denied the possibility of a permanent organization of peace, young and old would have joined to condemn them as cynics. But if to-morrow they were to put their trust only or mainly in a new organization for collective security, to the neglect of national defence, the very young would call them old-fashioned idealists. That does not mean that the young are cynics; youthful cynicism is always skin-deep, for biological reasons not affected by any change in the *zeitgeist*. They must believe that somewhere there is and has been and will be the perfection of beauty and order. I think that is why Mr Eliot's latest poems of time and eternity have sold so well, but the young also need to see a vision of the world of common things as they were meant to be and might have been. One of them, Mr Norman Nicholson, pictures the garden of Eden in a poem called "The Garden of the Innocent":

> In the evening, the cool time, between sunset and moonrise,
> Under a star un-named of a pagan name,
> Under the green sky, under the broad leaves,
> Under the dark green shadows of the brown trees,
> On the darker grass and moss and ground-ivy
> That scents the heels which crush it and the dust,
> Among the dew and the wood-sorrel, in the cool of the day,
> Move the creatures who have never been me.
>
> The light on their limbs is pale as a hazel kernel,
> Smooth as peeled bark as they walk between the pines,
> Where the dark cones open in the dry air,
> Where the squirrels are friendly, the voles without fear,
> And the throstles call from the resinous branches.
> There as the green light ebbs from the sky
> They sleep beneath anonymous constellations,
> Undisturbed by chatter of sedge-birds from the river.
>
> These are the creatures who have never been me.
> Slayers of dragons have been me, and tamers of snakes,
> And those who pressed the fangs in their own flesh,
> And those who lied for fear of snakes or killed for lust of them,
> Those have all been me; but never these,
> Who heard the voice in the upper branches and were unafraid.

This innocence cannot be recovered by introspection or psychoanalysis, nor by any understanding sympathy for the animals and birds, who "know neither temptation nor conscience, choose neither innocence nor sin," nor can it be reached by any mystical ascent which seeks to transcend the limits of humanity, but in "The Holy Mountain," the sequel to "The Garden of the Innocent," it is restored to the English countryside in a supernatural apocalypse:

> The fell shall rise white above the six-pronged blaze
> Like steel in a furnace, high as the skies,
> Deep as the ice of hell.
> And the creatures shall come from the orchard, the dale and the shore,
> Shall gaze at the blaze and pass through the fire
> And walk on the fell.

The wolf and the sheep together, the young wolf and the lamb,
The fox and the chicken,
The weasel and the rabbit through the fire shall come
And lie down in the bracken.

Meanwhile we must accept our limitations as means of grace and discipline,

Not in the prospectus of a blind to-morrow,
But in the scything of nettles shall we find bread,
In the burning of thorns shall we find warmth.
The hand that is stung by nettles shall know deftness,
The foot that is pricked by thorns shall develop strength.[1]

The tone shows that this is not pessimism, but the tone is conditioned by the context. Here man is fallen, and therefore capable of redemption. He is not only imperfect, haunted by "the filthiness that goes a little deeper," as he so often is in Mr Eliot's poetry, early and late. The danger of a sense of guilt that is not accompanied by a positive picture of human integrity, not only out of time but in time, is that it may lead some people to romanticize their own evil, after the manner of Byron in his weaker moments. At this moment in the history of our civilization, when we have lost the political ideals which helped to give inspiration and dignity to the humanism of the last two centuries, we need above all things a new vision of the nature of man, not only as he is, but as he might have been. Man is the same, whatever we think of him, but his notion of himself changes with the pictures of himself he frames, as a Byronic hero, or as a penitent sinner.

George Every, S.S.M.

Kelham.

Luther and the State

Perhaps none of Luther's thoughts and deeds has been so much misunderstood as his attitude towards the State. It is one of the stumbling-blocks which seem almost impossible to overcome, not only in this country but on the Continent as well, even by people who try to get rid of their prejudices. One of the things Luther is blamed for is his "inconsistency." The trouble is that critics of this kind do not realize that Truth is never onesided and therefore that Luther's thoughts were, of course, "dialectical," as the Gospel certainly is. Thus, if you want to understand Luther in the very depths of his thought, you must try to grasp both sides of his views at once. If you drop either of them, you miss the point altogether; *e.g.*, to say, "It is easy to see how Luther prepared the way for Hitler,"[2] is not wrong in itself, but it is certainly not the full truth. For, as we shall see later, it was not altogether

[1] "The Garden of the Innocent," IV. This poem, and "The Holy Mountain," are to be found in a little book of *Selected Poems* by John Hall, Keith Douglas, and Norman Nicholson, which has appeared in the "Modern Reading Library" (John Bale and Staples, 83-91, Great Titchfield Street, W.1, 2s. 6d.).

[2] Archbishop W. Temple in *Malvern, 1941*, p. 13.

Luther's fault that some or even many of his followers understood only one side of what he really said and meant. Therefore we must go back to Luther himself, putting aside, if possible, all prejudices.[1]

1. First of all, Luther made a very clear distinction between the Kingdom of God and the kingdom of this world. He did it in order to stop the confusing of the two made by most people before him, and in order to save both. The underlying foundation of this distinction is, of course, his principle of distinguishing sharply between Gospel and Law. But do not make a mistake right at the beginning: distinction in both cases does not mean division. As Gospel and Law are essentially different from each other, and yet dependent on each other, the same is true of the heavenly and the worldly order. In the first God's love reigns only, the other is under God's wrath as well; but the wrath must submit to love.

According to Luther the Christians as such do not need a worldly government at all. They would live in accordance with the Sermon on the Mount, they would not fight each other, they would "have the Holy Spirit within their hearts who teaches them and makes them not to cause harm to anybody, to love everybody, to suffer injustice, even death, from all, willingly and cheerfully."

The Christians, however, are and will always be a small minority, "scarcely one true Christian in a thousand" (17, i, 149). The Gospel alone would not work, since the great majority who are non-Christians need another, an external power as well. Moreover, even the Christians are not simply Christians, they also are sinful people. Thus man as he actually is (not as he ought to be), needs another régime as well, a régime of law, which can even force him. Man as he is needs a "schoolmaster." "For as only a few believe and still less behave themselves as Christians, not resisting the evil, God has created beside the Christian state of affairs and His Kingdom another régime and has subjected them to the sword" (30, ii, 555). It is not due to a peculiar "pessimism" of Luther's mood but to the reality as he experienced it that, he said, without law and a lawful and powerful government there would be chaos among men. "For the world is full of devils" (31, i, 82). "If somebody tried to govern the world according to the Gospel and would abolish all worldly law and the sword, pretending all were baptized and Christians . . . the wicked would misuse Christian freedom under a Christian pretext."

For the Christian, however, there are still two positive reasons for acknowledging and supporting the authority of the State. "Because a true Christian on earth does not live for himself but for his neighbour and serves him, he does even what he does not need himself but what his neighbour needs and is helped by." Thus the positive motive of serving the State is Christian love.

[1] As I am of the opinion that Luther was not inconsistent, at least with regard to all main subjects, we shall quote from his writings regardless of the different times in which he wrote. The modern Continental research has given abundant evidence that the division between the "young" and the "old" Luther, as formerly taught, was at least a great exaggeration. We shall add the sources of our quotations as taken from the "Weimarer Ausgabe"; if nothing is added, it is a quotation from "Von weltlicher Oberkeit," 1523, WA. 11.

The strongest argument, however, for the existence of the worldly government is this: "Omnes fructus charitatis cogimur omittere non stante magistratu in pace" (26, xxxii, 10). "The sword serves the Gospel so far as it preserves peace among the people, without which one could not preach" (23, xiv, 18). In this way the State serves the Kingdom of God, not directly but indirectly; and God's children serve the State, which needs true Christians. For "how should it be, if God should withdraw His Hands [*sc.* from the world and the princes] and the Christians should cease praying?" (45, 535).

2. To say that the State and worldly affairs have nothing to do with God is just the opposite of what Luther had in his mind. This is evident when we look at the standard passages, Rom. xiii and 1 Pet. ii, so often quoted by him. He translated ἐξουσίαι, the higher powers, by "Obrigkeiten" or "Oberkeiten"—*i.e.*, the authorities standing above. It might be questioned whether his translation is correct, but there cannot be any doubt that Luther did not forget that these authorities, high as they may be, are ordained of God. God gives them authority, but He also restricts their authority. Both points are essential. Let us consider one after the other.

(*a*) Luther places the authority of the State very near to that of parents. When he explains the fifth (in his order the fourth) commandment he deals with both. "Though He could rule, shield, and protect wife and children, house and estate without us, God will do so through us, and ordains fathers and husbands. Item, He could rule in a worldly way, preserve peace, and punish the wicked without kings, princes, lords, and judges. He will, however, not do so; but He passes on the sword and says: punish the wicked, shield the devout, handle the peace. Yet He Himself acts through us, and we are nothing but masks behind which He hides Himself" (23, 8). Or, as Luther likes to put it: God works through the princes as if they were His "Left Hand." "The Lord Jesus Christ's Kingdom is a spiritual hidden one, whilst the visible and bodily goods are called the Left Hand of God, though they all are subjected to Christ." It is because the worldly authorities (parents as well as States) are ordained of God, that Luther demands obedience to them, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward. Disobedience is, in Luther's eyes, the worst of all sins. He does not dream of replacing the God-given princes by others, as he would not dream of replacing his parents. Here we must take into account, of course, the time in which he lived, a time not of parliaments but of princes only who were absolutists.

Now it is important to note that Luther, who is usually looked upon as an uncritical servant of the princes, is fully aware that the majority of them are no angels. He exposes their faults without any hesitation: "Usually they are the greatest fools or the worst knaves on earth. You should know that from the beginning of the world a prudent prince has been a rare bird, and a devout one still more rare." Being a Christian realist and not an illusionist, Luther agrees with St Augustine's condemnation of States as "magna latrocinia" (19, 370).

But "abusus non tollit usum." "Although they do wrong as the King of Babylon did to the children of Israel, God nevertheless demands our

obedience without any deceit." He goes so far as to call the authorities "which make and keep law" gods—*i.e.*, they are second best after the Gospel and the ministry because they "help God in doing godly, superhuman works" (31, i, 199).

(*b*) But all this is said, of course, of those who "make and keep law" (which in the German term means also "the right"). That brings us to the other side: the power of the worldly authorities is not unlimited; it is limited by Him who has placed them in such a high position. "I am certain that God's Word will not bow or conform to the will of the princes, but the princes will have to conform to the Will of God." What Luther says of parents applies to all authorities: "He will not have knaves and tyrants for this office and government. He neither gives them the honour, *i.e.*, power to govern, in order that they may allow themselves to be adored, but that they first of all should look after their office devoutly and truly." The State is of highest value, but it must not forget that it belongs not to the first, but to the second of the tables of stone—*i.e.*, not to the Divine but to the earthly things, though it is God's representative on earth.

3. Let us now consider what these principles imply. What are the State's duties? To protect its inhabitants from enemies both outside and inside. Therefore, a powerless prince or a prince who does not make adequate use of his power at the right moment is a disgrace because he disobeys God who has given him power. (*a*) With regard to what we should call to-day foreign politics Luther makes a very clear, we may think too simple, a distinction between "just" and "unjust" wars. He warns all "not to aggress or to start a war . . . as there is ultimately no fortune in it." Wars should not be fought for the sake of religion, not even for the sake of the Gospel. For that would mean an attempt to solve spiritual problems by worldly weapons. (This argument was one of the strongest which he used in the Peasants' War, and which has made him so unpopular even until now.) Even the "Christian" army fighting the Turk should not be called Christian; for among them are "scarcely five Christians, and [the others] are perhaps worse men than the Turks themselves."

The only sound reason for taking up weapons is to defend the country against aggressors. Luther advises that the aggressor should be offered "first law [*Recht*] and peace as Moses taught the children of Israel. If he refuses it, do your best and defend yourself with force . . . and here you should not consider . . . how you will remain in authority, but consider your subjects to whom you owe protection and see to it that your work may be done in love [*sic*!]. And though you cannot prevent some from becoming widows and orphans you must take care that they do not all become widows and orphans." To describe, as Troeltsch did, Luther's non-pacifist attitude as if he "glorified force for force's sake," is absurd. (*b*) With regard to domestic administration Luther has given a good conscience to the princes, the judges, and even the hangmen, in so far as they perform their respective duties honestly. Their duties, unpleasant as they might seem, have been ordained for the benefit of the people.

But what if the power bestowed on a man in his office to govern

others is misused? We have seen that Luther according to his principles denied the "right to revolt." How do we understand this attitude? Was it mere conservatism rooted in Luther's nature? I am sure it was more than that. It was, if we trace it in his own history, the reformer's very comprehensible fear of revolution, a "horror vacui," the fear that his supreme spiritual cause would be mixed up with and spoiled by a worldly revolution, and that the end would be a deluge. Let us not forget that he had to fight on two fronts at once: Rome and the fanatics.

Moreover, his outspoken aversion to revolution is deeply rooted in Luther's faith in God's guidance of history. Man should not interfere with God. It is He who sends authorities as He sends sickness; it is He also who will remove them in His good time. "These are very different matters, as remote from one another as heaven is from earth: to change the government, and to improve it. Changing may easily be done; improvement does not depend on our will and power but only on God's Will and Hand." "Reason shows that it is not good that disharmony should be in the world, and ponders how to get rid of it and to appease all strife in one united régime. But God says to it: No, nothing will come of it, it would not even be good, if it were like this" (24, 436).

On the other hand, we find this: "God does not leave it unpunished; as the world does not cease from sinning, God does not cease from punishing; He is always pushing one [prince] after another from his throne and puts others upon it." "God does not allow them to be wicked in peace and joy. He is close behind them, even around them, and has them between His spurs and in His reins." "For where man's strength enters God's strength goes out. Now, when a bubble is full and everybody thinks . . . they have won, and they themselves are sure also that they have brought it to the very end, then God pricks a hole into the bubble, and it has gone."

So we see: the balance between might and right is entirely in God's almighty hands. He overrules the history of mankind in a miraculous but hidden way. This aspect of God is not yet revealed to us. We must leave it to Him to restore His world when it is out of order. But is this not pure quietism? There is no doubt about it that many so-called Lutherans have misunderstood him in this way. But it can also be asked, What Christian challenged the worldly authorities of his time more frankly than Luther? He was definitely aware of his particular duty as minister of God's Word to urge them to do their duty properly; he prayed for them, he wrote to them privately, he addressed them in public. When Niemöller, in response to Hitler's demand to leave the State affairs to him only, replied that the ministers of the Church felt themselves responsible for the State as well, he showed himself to be a sincere Lutheran pastor who followed in Luther's steps. Luther was the living and most active conscience of the princes, the Christian teacher of the statesmen of his time.

We come now to the crucial point: Can there be, according to Luther's own presuppositions, a Christian statesman or is this a contradiction in terms? "Princeps ut princeps est politica persona, et sic agens non

agit ut Christianus qui nec est princeps nec masculus nec quicquam in mundo personarum" (End. 8, 344). He can even say in a sermon: "A prince cannot and shall not forgive; for he has another government than Christ who has a kingdom in which He rules over broken and contrite hearts; the emperor, however, rules over wicked knaves who do not know their sin but deride it. All these words [*sc.* of the Sermon on the Mount] do not apply to non-Christians."

Does this mean that Christianity is altogether severed from politics? By no means. Otherwise it would be senseless to address himself to Christian princes. The clue to this riddle lies in Luther's distinction between "person" and "office."

Why can the Sermon on the Mount not be used as a general rule for all regardless of their Christianity? Why can the world not be ruled by love? Luther's answer would be: because we are not only persons but we also have our office, our station in this world. "All Christians actually live in a spiritual state. The difference between them is only a difference of offices." We all stand as persons directly before God, responsible to Him only. As Christians we live in a sphere of love, described in the Sermon on the Mount. But at the same time we are a husband, or a wife, or a child, a servant, a judge, or a prince, or a priest. In this respect we are responsible for our neighbours as well, and we must ask ourselves how we may serve them in the best way in the given circumstances.

That is the reason why the answer to all ethical problems cannot be as simple as some Christians wish it to be—namely, to imitate Jesus. For His office in the world was different from ours; it was actually unique—*e.g.*, He was not married. Thus a married man or woman cannot simply imitate Him.

Every man has his particular office and must act according to its particular precepts. "Why should I tell and teach the tailor how to make a suit? He knows it himself. So I have to tell him only to use his craft well and in a Christian manner. The same is due to the prince: it is not up to me to teach a prince. I shall only tell him that he should act like a Christian" (10, iii, 380). That means you can serve God in every office. That is the new evangelical doctrine by which Luther freed the conscience of so many professional men, not only of the princes. Up to then "the highest scholars held the worldly government to be a heathen, human, ungodly thing, as if salvation only were a solemn matter . . . so that they ought to enter the ministry in order to serve God" (30, ii, 109). Luther is perfectly consistent when he dares to say, "If a judge performs his office and cuts off somebody's head, he does a work as good as preaching" (Buchw. ii, 530). "One must not look at the office of the warrior or of the sword with the eyes of a child, but with those of a man . . . then it will prove itself to be an office as godly in itself and necessary to the world as eating and drinking . . . a work of love like that of a surgeon" (19, 625).

Of course, each office has its particular dangers: "A prince too is a man and has always ten devils around him, whilst another man has only one, so that God must guide him especially and put His angels around him" (Predigt 1532). "Princes . . . though devout and God-

fearing, cannot be in their office . . . without sin; sometimes they do wrong to someone where they are most anxious to avoid it . . . Therefore they need special forgiveness." "As they have not to fear men, so they need to fear God more than others" (Magnif.).

Whom does Luther consider to be a proper prince? As we have seen, he does not feel himself competent to give detailed advice; he takes, however, certain pre-conditions for granted: "if the government is sincere and does not seek its profit" (30, ii, 223). In this connexion it is of interest indeed to realize that Luther, who was not at all in favour of either reason or natural law, here defends both; moreover, as K. Holl has shown, ultimately identifies both: natural law and the "law of love." The difference between a proper and a Christian prince (both "one of the greatest miracles and of the dearest tokens of God's mercy towards a country") seems to be this only, that the latter knows: "Christ, the supreme prince, came and served me . . . so I also will serve them by my office," and that he draws his strength to fulfil his duty from Christ.

4. But what then, if a proper government is not secured? Did Luther think of such a border-case which concerns us at present more than anything else? Yes, he did, though perhaps according to our view not enough.

What about revolution against a State which is not a "terror to the evil, but to the good"? Luther answers, "The law exists for the conscience's sake, not the conscience for the law's sake. If one cannot have both at once, keep the conscience and drop the law . . . the laws ought to punish, shield and prohibit, but if they confuse, then they are no longer law (or, the right) . . . Therefore if you find that the law is confusing the conscience, then break courageously through the law like a millstone through a cobweb, even if it costs you your life" (30, iii, 246). "Item if he should order men to bear false witness, rob, lie, deceive, etc. . . . then they should rather surrender property, honour, body, and life in order that God's command should remain." This applies even to a soldier: "If a prince should make war who had an unjust cause in public, you should not follow or help him." Luther adds, however, "but if you are not sure . . . fight with a good conscience" (19, 656 *f.*). Perhaps the strongest of Luther's words in this connexion are these: "When worldly force and authority urge a subject against God's commandment or hinder him in following it, obedience ceases and the obligation is cancelled: we ought to obey God rather than men" (6, 265). Or: "In such a case it has ceased to be authority" (30, ii, 196).

This border-case is in Luther's opinion definitely reached when the authorities claim to rule the souls as well—*i.e.*, when they try to interfere with religion and faith.

But *how* should a Christian resist? In both cases, when the moral conscience or when the Gospel itself is at stake, he is not allowed to resist actively. Luther is true to his principles that as a Christian he should rather prefer to die than to revolt against God's ordinances. "One should not resist evil but suffer it; but at the same time one should not approve of it, neither should one serve or follow or obey it,

neither by a step of one's foot, nor by lifting up a finger." For: "To suffer wrong does not harm anybody's soul; moreover, it betters, though it deprives them of the body and of the property. But to do wrong destroys the soul, though it might add profit to all the world" (5, 259). "And if you should win, what would be gained? You would have hindered God, lost His mercy . . . and become equal to the evil-doers and will be destroyed with them" (19, 656).

Now a few simple conclusions:

1. Luther was naturally a man of his time. Therefore, we cannot apply his sayings literally to our present conditions.

2. His principal ideas, however, are not bound to a particular time. That is mainly due to both the clear distinction between Law and Gospel and therefore between the kingdom of the world and the Kingdom of God, and to the unity of both rooted in the fact that the State is also ordained and limited by God, and in the personal conscience of the Christian statesman.

3. The danger of confusing both is to-day not less great than in Luther's time; and the analogous danger of leaving the worldly affairs out of God's control is still more obvious.

4. When the Nazis claim Luther as Hitler's forerunner, we should be very careful not to follow them into this trap, though we must admit that some of Luther's followers misunderstood him to a dangerous extent.

5. In order to avoid all sorts of short-cuts the Christians should go back to Luther's sound principles and enter the very depths of his teaching. That would bring them back to a balanced application of the Gospel to the problems of our age.

C. G. Schweitzer.

Wistow, Leics.

On the Future of Christian Education in South Africa

I. The critical experience through which the English Public Schools are at present passing has given rise to much thought in South Africa about the future of the Church Schools. The chief of these boys' schools are Bishops' and St George's Grammar School, both at Cape Town; St Andrew's College at Grahamstown; St Andrew's School at Bloemfontein: Michaelhouse in Natal; and St John's College at Johannesburg. The English Public Schools have been their model and an important source of staff supply. This modelling has been deliberate, and many would argue that it has been justified. But in view of present changing conditions in England it seems probable that, for the future, the South African schools must be more self-reliant. What is the future to be?

For some years there has been talk of founding a South African Church Schools Union similar to the Woodard Schools in England, and Mr R. F. Currey, headmaster of St Andrew's, Grahamstown, has

recently made some definite proposals for the creation of such a union. He envisages a "South African Church Schools Foundation," a union of the Church Schools with a central foundation council; an important principle to be established is that all staff promotions be limited to men already in the service of the foundation. This principle is designed to overcome the evils of what is called "inbreeding." Mr Currey points to the fact that, while the headmasterships are normally reserved for overseas men, there must inevitably be a number of capable men who, realizing at an early age that they have advanced as far as they are ever likely to go in their profession, grow sour and unhappy in their work.

The difficulties of working such a union are apparent; for example, few school governors, who are usually distinguished and extremely busy men, would have time to travel the vast South African distances and to meet frequently enough to administer the schools adequately. Furthermore, complete "inbreeding" between five or six schools may produce worse evils than partial "inbreeding" confined to one school. And there is the danger arising from co-option. Undenominational schools like Hilton or the Johannesburg Girls' Rodean might become influential members of the foundation in such a way that the foundation ceases to be specifically Anglican, but merely representative of a certain type of English culture.

However, these dangers and difficulties might well be avoided and overcome if the foundation is carried into effect with the right motives. These motives cannot be limited to self-preservation, to staff advantages, nor to the strengthening of what may be called a middle-class English culture. The right motives for such a foundation concern the building up of a sound form of Christian education in South Africa, so that the Church Schools may possess something which it will be vital to preserve.

In the past the Church Schools have done much to justify their existence. Their function in the future is likely to be more important. From recent controversy about religious education, it is plain that the state schools can do little to teach Christianity; in fact many deny that it is their duty to attempt to do so; if Christian education is to survive at all it will be in the Church Schools.

II. The development of Christian education will more effectively be encouraged by the formation of the Church Schools Foundation. The schools are in different parts of the country, and they will all gain in effectiveness if they are governed by a strong central authority, and if they pool their resources. But they must have a definite policy and be directed by a steady Christian purpose. This policy must direct attention to many urgent problems.

1. Religious instruction is often inexcusably bad; syllabuses are vague and unsystematic; teachers are frequently uninformed, if well-meaning, which is not always the case. Divinity lessons ought to be as academically respectable as lessons in any secular subject. More use ought to be made of such schemes as the Cambridge Divinity Syllabus. There should also be courses in Christian Ethics and Sociology.

The Schools ought to agitate for a theological faculty at the English-

speaking universities; at present it is impossible for an English-speaking South African to take a university course in theology. Furthermore, South Africa stands in great need of an educated Christian laity.

2. But while theology may be taught in the classroom, not so religion. A boy can compulsorily learn the arguments for the existence of God or study the social implications of the Christian doctrine of man, but he cannot be compelled to say his prayers nor to live a Christian life. Such things must be inculcated. Hence the importance of staff influence (see below) and of social and industrial tours, visits to mission stations in both town and country, assisting at boys' clubs, encouraging interest in local government.

3. South African schools, like all schools, are conditioned largely by the world for which they have to educate. Hence the stress on examinations, on educating for wealth, ambition and social success. These are educationally undesirable factors, to be weakened whenever possible. Much might be done to teach the value of human personality by general encouragement of creative hobbies, the playing of musical instruments, arts and crafts, woodwork, etc., and by the discouragement of recourse to external stimulants such as the uncritical use of the cinema, and all facile amusement. Direction of reading is important in this respect. The average South African boy tends to read little but matriculation set-books and American magazines.

4. A glaring gap in our present system of education is the entire lack of adult education. Many vital subjects, like philosophy, literature, and history, can be appreciated only by adults who have had some experience of life. It is foolish to imagine, as many people do, that a boy of sixteen who has matriculated is therefore educated. The Church Schools could encourage an adult education movement by providing courses of lectures during the annual long holiday. Some Old Boys would probably welcome such an opportunity of returning to school each year for a short course of study and reading. The teachers themselves might welcome such an experiment, for it would encourage them to keep up their own reading. There is in normal times a surprising number of teachers who read little but the sporting columns and detective fiction.

5. The general conditions of the South African native are admittedly bad. There is no free compulsory education, wages are inadequate, and social services extend to a very small proportion of those who need them. The Church Schools could open and run night schools for natives, raise wages and generally improve the conditions of their own employees, thereby demonstrating to South Africa that such a progressive policy is not only Christian but practical.

6. The South African Church Schools do not, on the whole, suffer from the class consciousness which afflicts some English Public Schools. Nevertheless, they should safeguard themselves against this possible danger by providing liberal scholarships and "free places," so that a certain proportion of their pupils will always represent the poorer people. Such a policy, difficult and expensive in its early stages, pays in the long run, for it is the Old Boy, conscious of a real debt to

his school, who proves to be the generous friend and benefactor. The boy who pays high fees often adopts the attitude that he pays for everything he gets. Class consciousness will also be avoided if all boys have to perform a certain amount of menial work, such as cleaning their own shoes, making beds, etc. The South African boy tends to rely more upon native servants than is really good for him.

7. The plan of helping the poorer Christian people who desire Christian education for their children will best be furthered by the provision of more schools like St George's Grammar School, which accepts a high proportion of day boys. A just criticism of the South African Church Schools is that they have in the main provided only for the comparatively well-to-do. While their fees are low by English Public School standards, they are still beyond the means of the majority of South African people. The establishment of these day schools can only be undertaken by a strong central authority acting with the support of the Anglican Church, such as that envisaged by the Church Schools Foundation.

8. Inadequate attention has been given to the care of the staffs of the Church Schools. Schoolmastering is a difficult and often disappointing job; the pay is poor; the routine can be stifling; academic interest easily dies; the job has special temptations towards impatience and overbearingness, the results of living in a small and artificial world. The gibe of a modern novelist, that schoolmasters are "men among boys and boys among men," may have some truth in it. Therefore, care must be taken to safeguard staff against these conditions. Long leave should be compulsory and under supervision, every five or seven years; return to university for fresh study and reading should be encouraged for the younger men; business and professional men should appear more frequently on the staffs; temporary exchanges with teachers in other countries are also useful. By such means it should be possible to maintain a broad outlook and a high standard of efficiency among the staff. In some way or other, a sense of the high vocation of teaching must be kept alive. Just as the boys must be taught the social significance of what they learn at school, so too the staff must be taught the social function of the school and their jobs in it.

If the formation of the Church Schools Foundation will lead to development on these lines, its formation may later be regarded as a landmark in South African history.

III. If and when the crisis faces the South African Church Schools, what lines of action will be open?

1. The financial problem may be solved by accepting state aid, as has already been done in the case of St Andrew's, Bloemfontein. The conditions which go with such aid involve periodic inspection (the State must insist upon the efficiency of any undertaking it finances); the conditions may also involve interference with syllabuses and the content of instruction; non-Christians may also be given the right to attend the school, and at the same time the right to absent themselves from religious services and religious instruction; appointments to staff may also be controlled.

From the point of view of preserving the independence of the

Church School, state aid on these terms would be undesirable. If it is unavoidable it can only be hoped that when the time comes the system of Christian education will have become so thorough, and in itself desirable, that the State will not want to interfere.

2. Strengthened by the formation of the Church Schools Foundation, another line of action may be possible. Since the crisis will, for practical purposes, be a financial one, general economy will have to be enforced. This will almost certainly involve lower salaries for staff. The staff may have to embark upon some kind of community life. Since at least half the staff will, ideally, be married, it is difficult to imagine how this community life would work out in practice; presumably it would involve communal housekeeping and the sharing of such things as cots, cars and perambulators. But this has been done with success by certain Quaker communities in Austria, and by other groups in America. And if such a staff community were to be a sound Christian community, it might have an immensely powerful influence for good upon the general life of the school; the boys would develop in the atmosphere of the Christian community.

There would be certain compensations for the members of the staff in such circumstances; presumably they would pay no school fees themselves, nor normal doctor's fees.

The effect of applying a drastic economy to the school as a whole might have far-reaching results. The boarding-school would have to aim at producing on the estate much of its requirements; dairy produce, vegetables and fruit might quite well be forthcoming, and the manual labour involved would, as far as possible, have to be done by staff and pupils alike. The educational progress thus achieved might prove to be revolutionary.

The above has been written mainly with the South African Church Boys' Schools in mind, but in principle it could apply also to the Girls' Schools, and to the non-European Schools.

H. E. E. Peacock.

St John's College,
Johannesburg.

Note

The Rev. Alan Webster, who contributed the article on "Parish Magazines" to the July number, is arranging another exhibition of parish magazines, to be held shortly in Sheffield. He will be grateful to any readers of Theology who send him specimens, good or bad, which might be included in the exhibition. They should be addressed to him at Attercliffe Vicarage, Sheffield, 9.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE FOURTH GOSPEL IN THE EARLY CHURCH. By J. N. Sanders. Cambridge University Press. 7s. 6d.

The author's purpose is to estimate the influence of the Fourth Gospel on Christian theology, including the heretical systems, up to Irenæus. He gives a well-documented and clear exposition of the Alexandrian Gnostic systems, and in a brief review one may be allowed to isolate his treatment of the Valentinians. Gnosticism being an elaborate attempt to state and develop the Christian gospel in terms of contemporary science and philosophy, the Valentinians claimed an intellectual affinity with the method and purpose of the Fourth Gospel, the pioneer attempt to reinterpret the Christian faith for the Hellenistic world. Mr Sanders assumes that this claim for intellectual affinity was justified, and that the Evangelist, while antagonizing an incipient Gnosticism, makes use not only of Gnostic terminology but of its ideology. The latter assumption, necessary to his main thesis, is very questionable. The Johannine writer, like a good missionary interpreter, makes use of his readers' language; but the Johannine terms, Logos, Life, Light, Truth, are much more easily understood in terms of Hebraic thought than of Hellenistic philosophy. Certain abstractions like *gnosis* or *pistis* he avoids, and his use of the corresponding verbs, "know" and "believe," suggests as their source the prophetic tradition of the Old Testament.

In order to support his interpretation of the Valentinian predilection for this Gospel, Mr Sanders is compelled to devote considerable attention to the question of its origin and authorship. Alexandria is boldly substituted for Ephesus as the place of writing. The Gospel is said to have been written by an Alexandrian Jew about 110 A.D., one who, like Paul, had studied in Jerusalem and had there become a Christian disciple. Evidence for an Egyptian provenance is found in the discovery of the Rylands and the Egerton Papyri, which are dated about 150 A.D. Also Heracleon, a disciple of Valentinus, wrote a commentary on the Gospel, which shows that it was well known and valued at Alexandria at a time when no other Church seems to have accepted it. Mr Sanders sees the reluctance of the Early Church to accept the Fourth Gospel as due to the fact that it came from Alexandria, an heretical centre. He also regards the Gospel as the beginning of an orthodox movement in Alexandria, while admitting that, owing to the disappearance of Alexandrian literature, such a movement cannot be traced until the time of Clement. If, however, it be true that the Evangelist was a champion of orthodoxy, and was so acknowledged in Alexandrian circles, is it likely that the Valentinian heretics would have made use of his work with such avidity?

Stimulating and interesting as this essay is, at several points the argument is vulnerable, as the author himself is modestly aware. Somehow or other the Gospel has to reach the Asiatic Church and be accepted by Irenæus as a weapon of orthodoxy. Mr Sanders accepts the Ephesian origin of the First Epistle and its different authorship.

Yet he assumes that the Alexandrian writer had read it and was influenced by it. Ultimately both writings were attributed to the Apostle—in Asia Minor. It is even suggested that the Valentinians were the first to ascribe apostolic authorship to the Gospel. There is a tangle here, and, on the whole, the usual theory of Ephesian origin is simpler, especially in view of the remarkable fact that the Gospel was claimed as authoritative by orthodox and heretic alike.

I would like to suggest that it becomes difficult to regard Valentinianism as a Christian heresy if *stauros* is translated "fence" and not "cross"; also in the list of "Dodecads," surely *Theletos Sophia* is not "wished-for Wisdom," but "Wisdom informed by the purpose of God."

R. H. Strachan.

Cambridge.

Vernon Faithfull Storr. A Memoir by G. H. Harris. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

In his sincere and modest preface Canon Harris avows that the "*flair* for biographical writing" has not been given to him. He may or not be right as to that; what is certain is that he has, out of his knowledge and affection, made a very living and appealing picture of a man who counted for more in the Church life of his time than many people realized. If Storr had accepted the offer of a bishopric, more than once made to him, his spiritual and intellectual powers would have brought him wide recognition. If, as might have happened, he had succeeded Dr Headlam as Regius Professor at Oxford, he would have added to his reputation as a biblical and philosophical theologian. The *Nolo episcopari* cost him little or nothing; the Professorship was a different matter, and, could he have trusted his health at Oxford, he might have accepted it. But for "promotion" as such he cared not at all; how wholly unselfseeking he was stands out in these pages as one of the most attractive characteristics in a personality endowed with many excellent gifts. However, if there was loss to the central counsels of the Church, there was much gain to the parishes that he served, to Westminster Abbey, and, above all, to the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement, of which Storr became the inspiration and the President. The broadening of Evangelicalism within the Church of England has owed more to Storr than to anyone else; while his spiritual fervour, and, especially, his power of biblical exposition, have ensured the retention of all that is best in what was once called "enthusiasm." To all this Canon Harris does full justice; on the other hand, it is surprising to find no consideration given to *The Problem of the Cross*, the book in which Storr set forth his conception of the nature of the Atonement. The place that a somewhat rigid doctrine of penal substitution has held in evangelical theology is of such importance that Storr's attitude towards it should have been given some attention. If Anglican Evangelicalism were definitely to come down on the side of the "moral theory," the distinction between it and Anglican Modernism, which is touched upon, would be less easy to define. Forsyth, while

accepting in its main features the standpoint of the higher critics, threw all his weight against any tendency to pass lightly over the Godward, objective, and even penal element in the Cross. Thereby he did a great work, and not only for British Congregationalism. What Storr did was rather of a corrective than of a positively valuable character.

The one obvious and great lack in Storr's activity was his failure to complete for the rest of the century his study entitled *The Development of English Theology in the Nineteenth Century*, which goes down to 1860. Of particular interest would have been a full-scale critique of *Lux Mundi* and of post-Tractarian theology. At the same time, I find it hard not to feel that Storr never had a sympathetic understanding, as distinct from agreement, of the Anglo-Catholic position in respect both of its theology and of its devotional practices. He was anything but a partisan; fairness towards others was in his bones; but his own tradition, outlook, and experience ran in quite different channels. All this made it difficult for him to appreciate the way in which Anglo-Catholics regarded the Eucharist, and their side of the controversy with regard to Reservation.

But criticism of his brother-Christians had no attraction for Storr. He was eminently a positive teacher, directing those whom he reached through sermons and addresses and books to the great themes of which he loved to speak—God, and the Mind of Christ, and the Bible. Here, and in the living out of his faith, he showed himself to be, with complete absence of self-consciousness, a true Christian man and a devoted minister of the Gospel.

J. K. Mozley.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Bible and the Early History of Mankind. By Humphrey J. T. Johnson. Burns Oates. 4s. 6d.

This book, which is addressed to Roman Catholics, has a wider interest. "Rome," says Fr Johnson, "ever slow to admit deviations from tradition, nevertheless always admits those which are necessary when the time is ripe." The time is over-ripe for most of the deviations that are admitted or suggested here, but it is interesting to see what reinterpretation of the opening chapters of Genesis is now allowed in a book bearing the *Imprimatur*. The author has reason for saying that "much trouble has arisen in consequence of theologians being so preoccupied with the *scandalum pusillorum* that they have neglected to avoid the *scandalum eruditorum*."

J, E and P are apparently admitted, though the author was advised not to call a spade a spade. "As . . . the terms 'Jehovist' and 'priestly writer' are associated with the school of criticism which assigns a late date to the Pentateuch, I have been advised to avoid them and in places, where it is necessary to distinguish between the two accounts of the Creation and the antediluvian history, to make use of neutral

terms such as document A and document B." As regards the theory of evolution: "There appear to be grounds for believing that the Church will never authoritatively interpret the account of man's creation in Genesis ii in a manner excluding the application of some theory of organic evolution to man, in so far as he pertains to the animal kingdom." The Biblical Commission in 1909 included as one of the matters touching the foundation of the Christian religion, of which the literal historical sense must not be called in question, *formatio primæ mulieris ex primo homine*. Fr Johnson says: "If . . . it be asked what the story of the creation of woman has to do with the foundations of the Christian religion, it must be replied that the object of the narrative is to teach the full humanity of woman, no less than her subordination in the family. . . . The decision of the Biblical Commission touching the formation of woman is not irrevocable, though it seems certain that for the present the Church does not allow a departure from traditional exegesis of this passage."

The author is able to deal more freely with the view that the patriarchs represent tribes or families, rather than individuals. In these and other matters "Protestant Fundamentalists" and "Conservative Catholics" are gently taken to task. "There are indications that in early times the Hebrews did not preserve an exact chronology, but dealt only in round numbers. . . . When . . . we are told that Moses died at the age of one hundred and twenty we may perhaps suppose that it is a way of saying that he died at the time of life at which a man might expect to become a great-grandfather." The suggestion is insinuated that the Mount Ararat of the Deluge may have been an artificial mound.

The author speaks of Fr Tyrrell as "having grown weary of his adopted faith and anxious to transform it into something at which the intelligentsia of a generation ago would not have mocked." We may hazard the opinion that Fr Johnson has himself felt rather more of this anxiety than appears on the surface of his book.

A. R. Vidler.

Hawarden.

Not by Bread Alone. By Angus Dun. S.C.M. Press. 5s.

It is a special pleasure to commend to British readers this most human and balanced guide to the devotional life, written by a widely known leader of the American Episcopal Church, in his own characteristic language, a gracious and dignified English, enlivened with an occasional Americanism, and always enriched thereby. The book is a simple study of prayer and meditation and worship within the orderly and peaceful pattern of the life of the Church. But though it is written by one who is himself wholly and happily at home within that life its writer is, at the same time, keenly alive to the perplexities and half-blind emotions and questings of those who stand and peep in at the door, and who have a half-longing to enter in, if they could but understand what is going on inside. "Going to church is for a good many a going into a holy fog, from which they emerge with a vague sense that

they have been in a good place but still bewildered as to what it was all about."

The book is thus a simple guide to prayer in its fulness. It makes plain the necessity of the ordered occasions provided by the Church. It develops the main types of prayer, thanksgiving, praise, complaint (an unconventional heading, but one very familiar to many a saint, as well as to Jeremiah), confession, petition. It dwells upon the need for listening as well as speaking. It opens a door into the wide spaces of sacramental worship. And it links all to that life of service in which the Church, the communion of charity, is most characteristically expressed.

Throughout there is a pungency of phrase which gives the book a real note of challenge. "It is far easier to forget that we do not live by bread alone than to forget that we most certainly do live by bread." "Magical prayer is a crude kind of fake science which hopes to get something by pressing the right button." "Even, miracle of miracles, the Word of God may come to us through a preacher." "The constant test of the reality of worship is the kind of people who go back from it into homes, shops, classrooms, hospitals, courts, offices." There and always, *Sursum corda habemus ad Dominum.*

L. W. Grensted.

Oxford.

Exeter Cathedral, 1942. By S. C. Carpenter. S.P.C.K. 2s.

Just as the stroke of metal upon flint produces a spark that lights a fire, so the bombing of an ancient building creates an experience of such fiery intensity in the minds and hearts of all who intensely love it that a kind of new flame is left permanently burning in their souls. It is in the light and heat of this flame that *Exeter Cathedral, 1942* has been written. Looking back over the recent past the Dean first describes, with touches of whimsicality all his own, the long months of preparation and precaution, during which a close bond of fellowship in the Cathedral grew up between the varied personnel of the fire watchers. The scene is then suddenly shifted back a thousand years and we are made to watch the growth of the Cathedral stage by stage from its first beginnings under Athelstan down to the building as it now is. Then in a truly classical passage the love of all Devonians for their Mother Church is declared, ending thus: "So Exeter Cathedral arose, to be itself a perpetual act of adoration, the best thing that could be done with stone and wood, the gifts of God to earth, and with skill and money, gifts of God to men. It is a prayer, and the right thing to do is to pray in it."

The story of the injuries done during the bombings of April and May is told with dignified completeness and simplicity: the total loss of the Choristers' School, the Abbot's Lodge, the Chapel of St James, the Muniment Room, and three bays of the South Quire Aisle, and much other damage.

Recovery was immediate. Within twelve hours the Dean and Canons had met to make plans for restoration. The utmost use was made of those parts of the Cathedral in which worship was possible, whether in

the open air or inside. The salvage of precious monuments and furnishings was carried out with great devotion by many different hands.

The handbook closes with an excellent summary of the four main objects of a Cathedral, and with a moving sermon preached to the Friends of Exeter Cathedral on the following St Peter's Day, June 29, 1942. There the flame was burning very brightly.

COVENTRY. R. T. HOWARD.

NATIONS AS NEIGHBOURS. An Essay in Christian Politics. By Cyril E. Hudson. Gollancz. 4s. 6d.

A JUST AND DURABLE PEACE. A Discussion by Leaders of the American Churches, by 14 authors. S.C.M. Press. 2s. 6d.

Nations as Neighbours is a valuable handbook for discussion circles. There is a wealth of material in the chapters on the birth of nations and the roots of nationalism. I know of no small book which collects together so much data for helpful discussion. In the chapter entitled "After the War" the author discusses both Hitler's new order and any variant of an Anglo-American hegemony and admits that "some minimal form of voluntary federalism" represents the only tolerable alternative to the existing anarchy of Absolute States. He commends Mr Lionel Curtis' well-known proposals in a general way, but rightly queries the assumption of some federalist schools that unity can be achieved by a political organization from above. One cannot help wishing that a more definite analysis of the Lex Naturæ had been made in order to support the contention that politics depend on ethics and ethics upon a metaphysic which must be religiously based. We are all waiting for a book which does justice both to Natural Law and to the fact of Original Sin. But the great fight is with those who, like Dr Julian Huxley, argue that the human spirit, in both its individual and corporate aspects, is the source of all value. It is hardly enough to say that "the Church must revive her claims to be the interpreter of Natural Law," for Natural Law has to exist and be recognized before it can be interpreted. However, this book is to be commended most warmly; not only the text, but the thirty pages of notes will repay the most careful study, especially by those who think it is simple to apply "the Gospel to social problems."

Every book which helps to bring the thoughts of the religious leaders in the United States before the people of Britain and vice versa is to be greatly encouraged. All the essays in *A Just and Durable Peace* are not of the same value, but the whole impression is of "a singularly temperate, wise and penetrating account of the American standpoint," as Dr Paton says in the foreword. The editor, Dr Dulles, calls for the rebirth of a sense of mission in the American people in the place of shallow cynicism and disillusionment. Dr Hocking writes with his usual incisiveness of the task of the Churches in wartime. He points out how easily hatred for enemies becomes a cloak of self-righteousness; how certainly hypocrisy in the mind prevents vision; and how impossible it is to make right

decisions while inflamed by passion. He calls on the Church to be the primary source of morale by showing that she has "a present intuition of the mind of Christ." Dr John Mackay of Princeton insists that the Church must never identify itself with any particular order or society, but should proclaim the eternal verities to which the political order should be "made to conform" and in virtue of which the relatively good can be distinguished from the relatively bad. Dr Eagleton (Professor of International Law in New York University) insists that the suggestion of an international organized force depends for its success on the degree of justice attained in the nations who combine for that purpose. The Bishop of Missouri, Dr Scarlett, in a striking essay, lifts the debate above military victory and peace treaties and above formal acts of renunciation of aggressive force, etc., into the spiritual realm where peace has to be continuously re-won in the present and is never to be regarded as a thing which has been won. Only when peace has been given to man from above can he hope to show consideration for others or really understand them. It is to be hoped that this book will be widely read.

LAMPETER. H. K. ARCHDALL.

FATHER ADDERLEY. By Canon Stevens. Werner Laurie. 3s. 6d.

This little memoir by one who knew Adderley intimately, especially in those later years when he had outlived most of his contemporaries, should serve a useful purpose if it reminds readers that some men are too big to achieve success. They are cast for the more noble rôle of failure. From these pages one would gather that James Adderley was never conspicuously successful after his early period at Poplar. But the attentive reader will see much more than "success" in this modest chronicle. Adderley was one of those men who was sent to (or rather who sought) the "Cinderella" tasks of the Church. He took on dead parishes which no one else would look at and re-vitalized them. And his real gifts came out in dealing with individuals. How many there must be who owe everything to this good priest, whose kindness was inexhaustible though often abused! His memory will not fade nor will his influence soon be forgotten.

MARCUS DONOVAN.

THE RUMANIAN CHURCH. By Marcu Beza. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

It is hard to say what sort of public will find this book interesting. Like the others in the same series, it is attractively produced, within the restrictions of wartime; and with its excellent whole-page illustrations it would appear to be an introduction for the popular reader. The Roumanian Church in the vigour of its life and the importance of its place among the autocephalous Orthodox Churches of Europe deserves a good introduction. But it is to be feared that this book will only bewilder, with its rather unordered sequence of dates and names of people and places so far beyond the ken of the ordinary reader. Eastern European names are not easy to carry in the mind for the

Englishman, and he is not helped by the inconsistencies and unnecessary variations in the spelling of Roumanian names in this book. The selection of anecdotes and details from the nooks and corners of history does not leave one with an attractive, clear, nor (fortunately) truly balanced picture of the Roumanian Church, and it is to be hoped that those who know nothing of her will not try to form their judgment from what they read here. The author is a learned professor who takes a very real delight in the history of his country, and holds strong views on some of its more controversial parts. These are qualifications from which much profit might come, but they are not necessarily the qualifications for writing popular little books, and Dr Beza might do better to keep to the edification of a public more expert or informed in Roumanian matters.

M.

THE FIVE BOOKS OF MOSES. By Oswald T. Allis. The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia, 1943. 319 pages. $3.

The purpose of this book is described by its subtitle: "a re-examination of the modern theory that the Pentateuch is a late compilation from diverse and conflicting sources by authors and editors whose identity is completely unknown." It is a fundamentalist work which seeks to show that the Pentateuch, as it stands (with the exception of Deut. xxxiv.), was written by Moses, that doubts about the authorship of the legislation ascribed to him are unjustifiable, and that the commonly accepted documentary theory is arbitrary and unnecessary. The late Professor S. R. Driver is regarded as the high priest of "the critics," and his *Introduction to the Literature of the O.T.* is made a priority target of the "re-examination."

The book abounds in passages of extreme naivety. On p. 7 we read, "the author of Deut. xxxiii. might well be the recorder of Gen. xlix. It is true that the Book of Genesis nowhere claims to have been written by Moses. But an account of the origin of mankind or at least of the ancestors of Israel such as is given there is required to make the other four books intelligible. Furthermore, the 'and' (or, now) with which Ex. i. 1 begins is an indication that this book is a continuation, and only in Genesis do we find the history recorded which Exodus continues." And on p. 83: "The birth of Isaac was so remarkable an event and so momentous that it is quite natural we should have three references to the significant name which was given him: one telling that Abraham laughed when the promise was made to him (xvii. 17-19); a second, that Sarah laughed when it was repeated in her hearing (xviii. 12); a third, that when Isaac was born, Sarah declared that God had caused her to laugh and all who heard of Isaac's birth would laugh (xxi. 6). In all three cases the circumstances are different. There is no reason for regarding them as three conflicting accounts of the name Isaac and assigning them respectively to P, J, and E."

On p. 141: "When David declares that his enemies have tried to drive him forth from the heritage of the Lord, saying, 'Go serve other gods' (1 Sam. xxvi. 19), this may suggest the idea that Jehovah was in

such a sense a local deity that one banished from the land and nation could not serve Him. But David's own view, as set forth in Ps. cxxxix. is a quite different one. . . ."

On p. 63 Mr Allis states that *bethulah* means the same thing as '*almah* without apparently being aware that some justification of this statement is demanded. On p. 171 the case for an improbable translation of Jer. vii. 22 is given away by the remark, "at the first the people listening to Jeremiah might think that (*i.e.*, the usual rendering) was his meaning."

The reader is likely to be impressed rather by the cumulative strength of the arguments for the critical position, even as set out by Mr Allis, than Mr Allis's own thesis. The book will only carry complete conviction to those who feel that their religious experience is inseparably linked to a fundamentalist view of the Bible, and who hold that critical views of the Pentateuch are inconsistent with the traditional Christian beliefs concerning the Fall and Redemption.

D. G. Hill.

Chislehurst.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

W. H. Allen: S. Desmond, *You and God* (9d.).

Atkinson: J. E. Roscoe, *Realism* (1s.).

Blackwell: *The Function of a University in a Modern Community* (1s.).

William Blackwood and Sons: John Baillie, *The Prospects of Spiritual Renewal* [The Moderator's closing address to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, May, 1943] (1s.).

James Clarke: A. L. Drinkwater, *People's Prayer Problems* (6d.).

Dacre Press: Eric Abbott, *Foothold of Faith* (1s. 6d.); D. G. Peck, *Collectivism and the Catholic Tradition Regarding Property* (1s.); Phyllis M. Potter, *Religious Drama and Worship* (1s.).

A. Dakers: Anon., *Son of Light* (9s. 6d.).

Faber and Faber: Charles Williams, *The Figure of Beatrice : a Study in Dante* (10s. 6d.); Nicodemus, *Renascence* (8s. 6d.); R. Landau, *Letter to Andrew* (8s. 6d.).

Methuen: L. LeMesurier, *God's Carpet* (8s. 6d.).

Mowbrays: Bp Heywood (Ed.), *Harry Woollcombe* (5s.).

Frederick Muller: Alan Thornhill, *One Fight More* (2s. 6d.).

National Society and S.P.C.K.: T. Grigg-Smith, *Thinking out the Faith* (2s. 6d.); E. D. Sedding, *Glory to God on High* (3s. 6d.); M. Bruce, *The Catechism Simply Explained* (1s.).

Pax House: L. Sherley-Price, *Queen of Peace* (3s. 6d.).

S.C.M. Press: H. R. Williamson, *China among the Nations* (6s.).

S.P.C.K.: M. Donovan, *Gospel Sermons, Notes for Preachers* (5s.); W. K. L. Clarke, *The Prayer Book of 1928 Reconsidered* (3s.).

Sheed and Ward: S. Timasheff, *Religion in Soviet Russia* (6s.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher